



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

be peculiarly objectionable, as concealing the analogies and derivation of words. We recommend those who study Syriac, even if for purely missionary purposes, to begin with the classical tongue. This, as is the case also with Greek, gives a foundation to work from, and the dialectical variations can then be easily learned, whereas a classical language is never grasped with any satisfaction after one of its modern forms has been acquired.

The book is written and compiled with much simplicity and clearness. Paragraphs and words referring to the ancient language are marked O. S., and those referring to each dialect with a distinguishing letter. Much that is written of the dialects applies of course also to the classical tongue, the differences of construction between the former and the latter being, as in Greek, in the way of greater modern flexibility. Yet, save in a few colloquial expressions, such as **ܐܢܝܢ** for **ܐܢܝܢ** and **ܡܢܗ** for **ܡܢ**, the classical scholar will not meet much that is altogether strange to him. One of the most notable innovations is the formation of the causative in verbs by prefixing **ܐܝܢ**, and even that has its root in Afel participles.

The classical student will find this book both instructive and interesting. There is something charming in the sound of many of the quadriliteral verbs, a long list of which is given, and this, as well as the instances of metathesis which follow, will often be found useful in clearing up puzzling points in manuscripts. The chapter on Hardening is indispensable for easy intercourse with the people. A few pages of proverbs add to the human interest of the volume.

CASTLE BRAE,
Cambridge, England.

MARGARET C. GIBSON.

GEOGRAPHIE DES ALTEN PALÄSTINA. Von D. F. BUHL. Freiburg i. B. u. Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr. 1896.

DR. BUHL'S *Geography* forms one of the series of summary handbooks entitled "Grundriss der theologischen Wissenschaften," and chiefly known to Old Testament students by Cornill's *Einleitung in das A. T.* and Benzinger's *Archäologie*. It is a worthy fellow of these eminent works. Within the narrow limits imposed by the plan of the series Dr. Buhl has succeeded in producing a rich, and almost exhaustive, work of reference. For years he has been known as an expert in the subject. Not only has he contributed solutions to a number of

problems in the topography of Hauran and Gilead, but in the twelfth edition of the *Lexicon* of Gesenius he has treated the whole of the place-names of the Old Testament with a fullness and accuracy never attempted in any previous dictionary of the Hebrew language, and excelled only by Dr. Francis Brown of New York, in the opening parts of the current Oxford Dictionary. Occasionally the summary plan of his volume has prevented Dr. Buhl from an adequate statement of the conclusions of other scholars from whom he differs, and I propose, therefore, to devote the most of this review to a discussion of some relevant matters in which I have taken some interest. His deficiencies on these points, however, are but slight drawbacks to a work the wide and accurate information of which will be admired most of all by those who have busied themselves with the details of so crowded and, in parts, so confused a field.

But first it will be right to note the fresh contributions which Dr. Buhl has made to our knowledge of names and places in Palestine. At a point in the history of Palestinian research, where we are confronted with a mass of hasty and unreasonable identification, it is a positive merit in Dr. Buhl's book that he has so few new proposals to make. The English survey of the surface of the country covered so many regions hitherto only partially investigated, and collected so many new place-names, that the temptation to over-identification naturally proved too strong to some of its leaders; and while we rejoice in the very numerous additions which they provided to the certainties of our knowledge of the topography of eastern Palestine, we must be excused from feeling the duty of even discussing a considerable number of their proposals. The Reduced Map of the English Exploration Fund, with the historical names of various periods in differently colored letters, is still quite the best map for students to work with or travelers to use in their tours through the land; but one has only to glance at its crowd of colored names to see that a large proportion of them must be ignored by those who wish to proceed not arbitrarily but with caution. Till excavation becomes general in Palestine her fields present the gleaner with but few and scattered opportunities of adding to the harvest of previous research, and the spirit of doubt will be more useful to him than that of adventure. Dr. Buhl is eminently sober and sound. Where so many are tempted to be original, he has passed the "self-denying ordinance" which, while it may limit the suggestiveness of his work, enables it to achieve the whole-some and reliable reputation of the rest of the series to which it

belongs. His proposals are almost exhausted by the following list: Ḥaṣer-ʿenon of Ezek. 47:17 he identifies (67) with Banias; with the Ḥarerim of Jer. 17:6 he compares the stony tracts in the Arabian border now known as Ḥarra (118); for Argob he proposes the district of Ṣuwet (119); for the Brook Cherith the Wadi el Ḥimar (121), rightly rejecting the W. el ʿAjlun as too much of a thoroughfare; he identifies (185) Sebbe, the modern name of Herod's Maṣada, with the Ḥaṣar Gadda of Josh. 15:27, and the ford over Jordan now called El-ḥenû with Pesilim of Judges 3:19, 26 (180); he takes (203) Tırṣa for the Tirathana of Josephus and both for the modern Eṭ-tire on the Maḥne plain; he favors (217 f.) the probability that the Aphek of Sharon of Josh. 12:18 lay on the plateau between Tabor and the lake where Sârônâ is still the name of a village, and that it was the same as the Aphek of the Syrian wars (1 Kings 20:26, 30; 2 Kings 13:17), and he proposes to find it in where Ṭamre now lies on the caravan route from Jezreel to east of Jordan; in North Galilee ʿUmm el ʿAwâmid is proposed (229) for the Hammon of Josh. 19:28; east of Jordan where the rational identifications are by no means so exhausted as they are on the west, Buhl repeats the valuable proposals he published a year ago in his *Studien z. Topogr. des nördl. Ostjordanlandes*: the more southerly of the two ʿAṣtheroths he places (248 ff.) at Muzêrib, a site the features of which in my opinion correspond very exactly with the descriptions of the ancient Casphon or Caspis, cf. 1 Macc. 5:36 with 2 Macc. 12:13 ff.; Raphon or Raphana of the Decapolis he seeks (249 f.) in Tell esh-Shehab, in the Wadi Tell-esh-Shehab; Ephron or Hephron of 1 Macc. 5:46 he makes identical (256) with the Gefrun taken by Antiochus the Great and properly places at the Kasr Wad el Gafr; Kamum of the same campaign of Antiochus he combines with Kamon of Judges 10:5, the city where Jair was buried, and seeks at Kumem, between Hephron and Pella, the third town taken by Antiochus (a double combination that I had already arrived at independently); Teṣil in Hauran he takes for the Tirsâ of 2 Kings 15:14, LXX Tharsila (247), he places (262) Ramoth Gilead at El Jalaʿaud, three miles south of the Jabbok, and identifies it with *the city of Gilead* of Hosea 6:8; in Moab he interprets (269) ʿAr or ʿAr Moab (Num. 21:15, 28; Deut. 2:9, etc.; Isa. 15:1) as the name not of a city but of a region, probably that to the south of Amon.

It is important that Dr. Buhl adheres to the following already advanced opinions. As against Sayce and others he accepts, as most probable, (164) the identification of Eḍ-ḍahariye with Kiriath-Sepher;

he prefers (167) the combination of Kiriath-Jearim with Kirjat el 'Enab, to that by Dr. Henderson with 'Erma; he takes (169) the usual view that Sanballat was from the Beth-Horons and not from Horonaim in Moab. He adheres (181) to the opinion, now almost universal, that Kōreā is to be sought for in Kūrawa and Alexandrium in Kārṇ Sarṭabeh; and counts it probable (199) that Antipatris is Kal'at Ras el 'Ain. He could hardly help approving (202) of the recent identification of the much questioned Gilgal of Deut. 11: 30 over against which Ebal and Gerizim lay, with Jūleijil, southwest of Shalem. He adopts (242) the conclusion that there was but one Bethsaida of Galilee, that on the east side of the Lake of Galilee; yet he identifies it not with Et-Tell the site of the ancient Julias but with the ruin el 'Araj on the coast of the lake and still connected with Et-Tell by the remains of an ancient causeway. He prefers (244) the identification of Kal'at el Hōšn with Hippos to that with Gamala, and accepts (263) Schlatter's proposal of a second Gadara at Es Salt, where there is a well named Jādur or Jêdur, which Gadara may have been that twice taken by Antiochus the Great, and once by Alex. Jannæus and called by Josephus (*Wars* VII: 3) the capital of Peræa.

There remain to be considered one or two points which have been and are likely to remain subjects of controversy.

On page 104 Dr. Buhl gives a number of reasons against the narrower definition of the Shephelah, which confines it to the detached range of low hills between the Judæan range and the Philistine plains, and in favor of the wider definition which includes within it the whole of the latter to the coast. He admits that it is expressly separated from Philistia in 2 Chron. 28: 18, but he thinks that the following reasons make for the inclusion of the plain: (1) 2 Chron. 26: 10 in which Shephelah is taken in parallel to the Mishor, east of the Jordan, as pasture ground; (2) the LXX translation of it by *πεδῖον* or *ἡ πεδινή*; (3) passages like Deut. 1: 7; Josh. 9: 1, in which the whole land of Israel is described, and the Shephelah stands in parallel with the Hoph ha yam, *i. e.*, the seacoast north of Carmel; (4) Josh. 11: 2 where the Shephelah actually signifies this stretch of coast; (5) the definition of Eusebius; (6) the list of towns in Josh. 15: 33 ff. especially verses 45-47 (which include the towns of Philistia). Now no scholar, who adheres to the narrower definition of the Shephelah as the more usual, will deny the occasional and very natural extension of the name across the whole maritime plain. In Palestine names were always more or less elastic, and as one looks down from the hill country of Judæa it is very easy

to comprehend the whole country, sweeping to the sea, under a common name. This would explain the definition of Eusebius, and the obvious intentions of one or two other writers. But against these one has to put the list of passages in which the Shephelah is definitely separated from Philistia. Buhl mentions only one, 2 Chron. 28:18. But Obad. 19 is another. 2 Chron. 7:1 recalls a time when the *Jews inhabited the Shephelah*, yet they never inhabited Philistia. 1 Macc. 12:38 describes the town of Adida *in the Shephelah*; while 1 Macc. 13:11 places it *over against the plain*. In Josh. 15:33 ff. the verses which include the Philistine towns, 45-47, are admittedly a later insertion. And the passages, Deut. 1:7, Josh. 9:1, which Dr. Buhl quotes as proving that the Shephelah included the maritime plain, because they distinguish it from the Hoph ha yam which he confines to the coast north of Carmel, may be adduced in support of its limitation to the low hills, if as seems more probable the Hoph ha yam includes the coast south of Carmel. The first reason quoted above that Shephelah is used in 1 Chron. 25:10 in parallel to the Moabite Mishor as pasture ground surely tells against—rather than for—the inclusion of Philistia, because Philistia was not a pasture ground like either the Mishor or the low Shephelah hills, but wheat country throughout. On these scriptural grounds, along with *first* the geographical isolation of the low hills, and *second* their frequent political separation from Philistia, it would seem to be certain that the name Shephelah was oftener used for the low hills alone than for the low hills *plus* the maritime plain.

On page 238 Buhl characterizes as impossible a recent attempt to revive the early Christian theory that Banias and not Tell el Kadi represents the ancient Laish or Dan. He puts the case of Tell el Kadi on the usual evidence. Josephus says that Dan lay by the sources of the little Jordan; Eusebius says that Dan lay four Roman miles west of Paneas; Kadi may be taken as a translation of the Hebrew Dan; and the name of the stream Leddân may possibly contain an echo of the same. But against all this we have to place, before coming to a conclusion, three very important facts: (1) Jerome (*Comm. aa Ezek.* LXVIII, 18) appears to identify Paneas and Dan: "Dan ubi hodie Paneas." (2) Deut. 33:22 speaks of Dan as *leaping from Bashan*; it is not possible to interpret this phrase of Tell el Kadi, which lies well out on the floor of the Jordan Valley, but it suits admirably the position of the castle hill above Banias. (3) No local power could have held the neighborhood from the weak and unhealthy

position of Tell el Kāḍi: Dan must have required to have its center and citadel at and about Paneas. No doubt the tribe held both of the sites, whose claims are thus contestant, but Paneas must have been the essential position; and we may account for the name Tell el Kāḍi, if, indeed, it be a translation of Dan, by the habit of drifting which names in Palestine have always exhibited. In any way Buhl's characterization of the case for Paneas as "impossible" is not justified. The case is, to say the least, as strong as its rival. If this volume have faults they are found in such summary dismissals of strong arguments. The question of the site of Capernaum is another instance. Buhl supports Tell Hum, but unduly depreciates both the ancient and modern support of the claims of Khan Minyeh.

Another point which is sure to provoke discussion is Dr. Buhl's acceptance of the theory of Blanckenhorn that the climate of Palestine has within historical times decreased in humidity and increased in heat. He seeks proof for this in the decay of forests of cedars upon Lebanon. But we may surely find adequate cause for the latter in the exportation of cedar from the Lebanons, of the constancy and large scale of which we have reports from very early Assyrian times down to the times of the Romans. In all the rest of Palestine we have no proofs that the climate is different from what it was in the period of the Old Testament.

Again, while Dr. Buhl in one passage seems aware of the fact that politically the east coast of the lake of Galilee was reckoned within the Province of Galilee, he yet calls (82) the lake the eastern boundary of the province; and in his section on the towns, villages, etc., of the land separates Bethsaida Julias, Khersa, Hippos, etc., from Tiberias, Capernaum, Chorazin, etc., a separation which lends awkwardness to the plan of his treatment.

But these faults, whether of method or conclusion, are very few, and do not detract from the value of a very thorough and almost exhaustive piece of work.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

FREE CHURCH COLLEGE,
Glasgow.

ENTSTEHUNG UND GESCHICHTE DES TODTEN MEERES. Von DR. BLANCKENHORN. 4 Tafeln und 8 Abbildungen im Text. Leipzig. 1896. Pp. 59.

THE book here noticed has to do with the most remarkable body of water on the globe. The surface of the Salt Sea is 1300 feet below